

Comprehensive Plan Review Committee  
Meeting Notes  
Wednesday, December 7, 2005

Sheldon Phelps, of Graystone Development, presented revisions to the proposal.

- Lots with reduced sizes would have more architectural standards required.
- Lots facing existing public rights-of-way would have additional architectural standard requirements.
- Buffer planting areas added to proposal.
- Tree preservation area added to proposal.
- A "Trail Staging" area was added to the proposal.
- The northernmost entryway along Shady Nook Road has been added to the proposal, with commitment to locate entry to minimize headlight impact on abutting homes.
- All dwelling units would be required to display street number.
- The parking lot on the church parcel shown in the "elbow" area was removed.
- Revised number of proposed units to reflect as maximum and a minimum number, as opposed to allowing a percentage change.
- Stated that use of Andover and Andover North amenities would be reciprocal.

Ginny Kelleher asked why no buffer was shown along the church parcel, whether the developed had provided the opportunity to add additional large lots without amending the PUD Document, and about the types of amenities proposed in Andover and Andover North. She also asked about the availability of the church grounds to the residents of Andover North.

There was discussion as to which parts of the proposal could be considered open space and which could not. The committee requested additional open space within the proposed development.

Sheldon Phelps stated that the proposed street layout had been reconfigured to eliminate dead-end alleys.

Gloria Del Greco asked about the return of the northernmost entrance along Shady Nook Road, and the two access points permitted to 186<sup>th</sup> Street.

Carolyn Stevenson asked for a clarification regarding the number of lots proposed, and whether the relocation of the roads resulted in a reduction in lots. Sheldon Phelps stated it had not. Carolyn Stevenson stated a concern with the density as it related to the provision of emergency services, and a concern with the proposed level of amenities.

Ginny Kelleher re-stated a desire for additional open space, and asked that the project provide approximately thirty percent open space. She referenced the amount of open space provided in Centennial. She stated that additional open space should be provided to compensate for the reduced lot sizes.

Ginny Kelleher referred to the lot sizes permitted in Andover, and the various building materials allowed. She referred to the prohibitions on aluminum and vinyl, and asked why Andover North proposes vinyl. Sheldon Phelps responded that it was to be able to provide a variety of housing product types. He stated that materials would not necessarily be the sole determinant of quality. Ron Thomas stated that too many aspects of the proposed building materials and architectural standards were below existing standards, and Ginny Kelleher agreed.

The committee identified five major issues:

1. More open space desired
2. Better development standards for dwellings  
Building materials and features
3. Amenities – additional or expand, timing of construction
4. Overall development standards, especially the “L” lots (setbacks, separations)
5. Overall Density

Further discussion ensued regarding garage orientations, building materials, and amenities.

Dave McFall, and abutting property owner, voiced concerns with the project's density, the lack of an identified home builder, and the premise that “empty nesters” would make up a substantial portion of the population of the project.:

Ron Morris, and abutting property owner, questioned the distance of the proposed setback from Shady Nook Road, requested a security service, requested amenities for the individual homes. He asked if RV parking would be allowed, and inquired as to whether a nine-hole golf course could be included in the proposal.

Discussion regarding the opinion of the committee as to the role of the church in the proposal followed. Committee members indicated that unless access for the HOA members was guaranteed through a legal agreement, it would not be possible for the committee to consider the area dedicated to the church as open space for the proposal. There was also discussion as to whether the church area should be considered for the purposes of determining density.